10-1-2016

Diversity, Neoliberalism and Teacher Education

Arturo Rodriguez
Boise State University

Kevin Russell Magill
University of Texas at Austin

Diversity, Neoliberalism and Teacher Education

Arturo Rodriguez [i]
Boise State University

Kevin Russell Magill [ii]
The University of Texas at Austin

Abstract
In this essay, we conduct a brief analytical review of teacher preparation programs, which claim to prepare lifelong culturally responsive teachers. Initial evaluation revealed factors limiting program success, they include: deeply embedded dominant ideological assumptions, use of traditional methods to train teachers, inability to understand or work toward non-hegemonic social relations and a pervasive and closed neoliberal epistemology limiting diversity in the preparation programs and profession. Finally, we critique existing understandings of teacher education, consider alternatives in philosophy, structure and function for preparation programs and critical humanism as a framework for working with teachers, to transform indoctrinating and dehumanizing educational practices.

Keywords: Culturally responsive, pedagogy, social justice, neoliberalism, labor

[i] **Arturo Rodriguez** is Professor of Literacy, Language and Culture at Boise State University. Arturo's work focuses in critical theory/pedagogy, critical humanism, and applied linguistics.

Correspondence: arturorodriguez@boisestate.edu

[ii] **Kevin R. Magill** is a Doctoral Candidate in the Department of Social Studies Curriculum and Instruction at The Universtiy of Texas at Austin. His teaching and research interests focus on critical theory/pedagogy in the social studies, critical humanism, teacher education and social justice. He currently works as an Instructor and Facilitator for Student Teacher experiences.

Introduction

Hierarchical structures originate in dominant ideologies creating barriers for supporting critically minded teachers. Conditions governing these ideologies are prevalent in even the most successful teacher education programs (Darling-Hammond, 2004; Delpit, 2006; Eryaman, 2006, 2007; Gay, 2010; Valenzuela, 1999). Carrying the flag of liberality, compassion and progressiveness new teachers typically begin their careers with good intentions. Despite culturally responsive and relevant training and what are considered righteous personal goals, teachers often reproduce inequitable and uncritical classrooms found in modern schools (Milner & Laughter, 2014). Cycles of reproduction ensure teachers rely on inherited social understandings of good teaching.

Lack of diversity in teacher training programs likewise perpetuates inequitable practices in the larger context of U.S. public schooling as creativity and divergent thinking are pushed aside to "alienate humans from their own decision making" (Freire, 2000, p.85). Similarly, teachers of color continue to be underrepresented in schools as they have been historically. According to the National Center for Educational Statistics, approximately 83.5% of teachers in the U.S. were categorized as White non-Hispanic in 2008 (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2008). Students interpreted as other: people of color, students with lower socioeconomic status, and students identified as non-heteronormative, rarely see individuals from their community reflected in positions of power: administrators, counselors or teachers (Ball & Tyson, 2011; Darling-Hammond, 2004; Delpit, 2006; Freire, 1998; Gay, 2010; Valenzuela, 1999). As academically successful, would-be minority teachers are persuaded away from education as a profession, encouraged instead to enter fields like business, law, or medicine, the overrepresented trend of a population of largely, ideologically, culturally and physically *white* teachers continues (Vilson, 2016). The assumption prospective minority teachers make: "Why waste your time as a teacher?"

Similarly, the education of privileged, culturally responsive teachers for work in pluralistic schools generally requires a personal transformation in the underpinnings of informed curriculum and pedagogy (Foss, 2002). Limited experience and understanding for practical success with children outside one's experience reinforces deeply rooted, culturally biased assumptions concerning the abilities of minority population children or children for who school is not designed. This is not to say one cannot or will not cultivate these understandings, however, performative schooling ensures education becomes culturally subtractive (Valenzuela, 1999), as teachers may not envision student beyond this paradigm. Many young teachers enter the profession understanding that assimilationist practices are in the best interests of students (Delpit, 2006; Eryaman, 2009; Gay, 2010). For these teachers, educational success means teaching students about the value of education for students' bettering or facilitating the adoption of white middle class cultural norms, standards of conduct or values. Examples in film such as Erin Gruwell of *Freedom Writers* (LaGravenese, 2007) perpetuate the notion of the semi-affluent savior teacher who commutes to the ghetto to work with children understood as other.

The triumphant narrative concludes as students adopt the cultural norms accepted by their teachers and pull themselves up by their bootstraps via a newly cultivated work ethic. Some teachers like Gruwell may achieve success with their students but teacher success is not attributable to students becoming more culturally white instead it is a consequence of a teacher's ethical posture, critical and culturally responsive pedagogy, a curriculum reflective of the ethnic and cultural backgrounds of the students and a caring and supportive school community (Darling-Hammond, 2004; Delpit, 2006; Gay, 2010; Gonzalez, Moll & Amanti, 2006; Valenzuela, 1999).

.

The Color Barrier

Teachers tend to identify with the homogenized epistemological norms that also govern their peers (Prinstein & Dodge, 2008). In this relationship persons are categorized via in/out groups (Tajfel, 1970), interacting as their membership fits the external social other. This categorization enacts the system, class-consciousness, and employs an embedded ideology as the "shared ideas or beliefs which serve to justify the interests of dominant groups" (Giddens & Sutton, 2009 p.1021) via social

relations, division, to perpetuate existing hierarchical structures. In doing so, students become alienated while those who see or understand the purpose of alienation, school power brokers, favor market mechanisms rather than supporting student success. Students themselves are left to understand and, "clarify this struggle against" (Foucault 1980, p. 24) alienation, in an effort to seek justice their consciousness becomes fractured. Classification in the form of labeling and or tracking ensures students begin to perform the socially constructed categories of smart, poor, special, brown, black, female, aggressive, deficient and so on, into which they are placed reconstituting a micro ecology of social relations within the larger social context (Hudak & Kihn, 2001). Students then become things to be acted upon for the teacher subscribing to this ideology. Labeling offers student teachers (and teachers) a way to conceptualize minority population students; they begin to understand othering using organizational symbols, such as at risk, low socioeconomic status, and Title I, among others (Cuban, 1989, Valencia, 2010). In this manner, teacher occurs as antipode of student, this is, similar to Derrida's notion of the binary opposite creating a violent hierarchy where "one of the two … governs the other" (Derrida, 1982, p.41). The relationship is based on power offered by the system for ascribing normalization and acceptance of inequitable relationships. Teachers then see students merely as object to be dealt with in the schooling and classroom hierarchy, and the relationships that occur are consigned the value of ritual or the above mentioned performative nature of human experience (McLaren, 1999). Students who are othered beyond the teacher/student binary are further categorized and subjugated as the label precedes them through the grade levels.

In socialization and ultimately indoctrination, teachers fill the benevolent colonial missionary narrative in their work with students, hoping to civilize or save their students. These teachers work from a deficit perspective (Valencia, 2010), believing lack of success is the result of a cultural (Payne, 1998/2005), community or familial shortcoming rather than a pedagogical or schooling issue that must be addressed. This transfer of responsibility frames a student as both victim and the cause of their victimization while absolving schools of their responsibility to care for and educate them.

A dangerous hegemonic narrative persists in the preparation of teachers despite the best efforts of socially minded teacher education programs (Blackledge, 1998). In choosing students for programs, education professors may look for students who are able to embody the values of critically responsive (Gay, 2010; Freire, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 2013) or constructive teachers (Erdal & Ongel, 2003), though sometimes decisions are made based on needed numbers to keep a program economically viable (Sleeter, 2012). Often these programs focus on Vygotskyan, Deweyan or Freirean philosophical frameworks (Dewey, 1933; Piaget, 1957; Vygotsky, 1978). Professors and instructors in these programs hope that wherever student teachers begin ideologically, their efforts will help children reach new cognitive understandings, instilling the notion that education must be experiential, democratic and/or critically conscious. Student teachers who adopt these frameworks often demonstrate an inclination toward inclusion, social justice, and a desire to become transformative educators (Bruce& Eryaman, 2015; Picower, 2011). Supported by an impressive admission packet, correspondence and interviews with faculty and other metrics, preservice teachers begin their journey away from the pattern of a traditional teacher (Darling-Hammond, 2006).

Many teachers then, apply the lessons of their programs in one of several ways (Smagorinsky, Lakly, & Johnson, 2002). First, teachers may adopt a more traditional classroom approach (eg. Picower, 2009); the ideology of the program is un-reflected in their teaching or the program itself did not reflect its espoused values. Another option, teaching may reflect the mission of the credential program and teachers realize disconnects between their teaching and the potentially problematic approaches caused through alienation. Lastly teachers may reflect the socially just focus of their program but find they need to re-negotiate their philosophy and what they may understand by the realities of schooling (Sleeter, 2001). In the last option re-indoctrination into the dominate ideology occurs as teachers navigate the distance between their undergraduate education and their vocation as classroom teacher: rigorous testing requirements, challenging placements and a culture hostile to the transformative epistemologies [critical race theory/pedagogy, multicultural education, education for social justice] to which teachers were possibly, though not necessarily introduced (Sleeter & McLaren, 1995). Similarly, teachers lacking the initial characteristics for acceptance to the

university/college program often pursue an alternative credential without significant theoretical or practical preparation (Ingersoll, 1999; Salyer, 2003; Shen, 2000; Walsh & Jacobs, 2007). Their previous background becomes a default modus operandi for their teaching, informed by positivist or individualistic professional experiences understanding teaching as a practice similar to a career in business, the military or other field (Giroux, 2015). These involvements, while enriching, may not provide the necessary experience to succeed as a culturally or critical responsive teacher, or to work with children of non-culturally dominant backgrounds (Cochran-Smith, 2004). Since many programs of this type do not require an extensive student teaching experience, integrated student teaching and coursework or much needed ongoing personal and professional development that support these values, critical or constructivist practices go unconsidered (Bartolomé, 2007).

Able to navigate systems in ways students of color cannot, newly minted culturally assimilated teachers often do not realize the full implications of a didactic or traditional pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 2009). They rarely engage students beyond the prescribed, aforementioned student teacher binary, as their understood role is to teach students to learn according to prescriptive definitions; rote memorization and maximization of time on task (Carr & Skinner, 2009; McLaren, 1999). To contemplate the fullness of their student's potential is therefore unnecessary. Traditional power relations lead to further reinforcement of uncritical practices even when a teacher's training, philosophy and intentions have been critical.

Teachers who were successful navigating schooling as a system, that is, secondary education to a major undergraduate teacher preparation university, have done so from within the traditional framework and thus at least partially understand the perceived inherent logic of its value (Bourdieu, 1999). Since the system worked for them, they imagine it must work in kind for their students; a problematic notion for students with needs beyond the traditional classroom (Magill & Rodriguez, 2015; Willis, 1981). Student teachers and new teachers become inundated with paperwork, school meetings, coaching appointments, hours of lesson planning and a variety of other every day school related conditions. Many young teachers then lose the coping skills, energy and ability required for creating critically and culturally responsive classrooms, focusing instead on instructional practices like simple lectures and on psychological survival (Kardos & Johnson, 2007). Society's perception of the teacher workday is 8-3:30, though a 50 hours workweek on average would suggest otherwise (Darling-Hammond, 2011; NEA, 2009). Critically and culturally responsive teachers may work longer hours, an apparent prerequisite for addressing needs of students beyond her (his) immediate and traditional classroom contact (Bartolomé, 1994; Gonzalez, Moll & Amanti, 2006; Kohn, 2000). When done well, teaching can be one of the most strenuous and demanding careers. Teachers often burn out from the tireless requirements. New teachers are more susceptible to this burn out, isolated by lack of community support (Ingersoll, 2003; Salyer, 2003; Shen, 2000); they often create an island classroom in which they exist apart from the school community (Kardos & Johnson, 2007). Without time, support or energy, students become first to suffer as new teachers struggle to survive (Peske & Haycock, 2006).

Neoliberalism and Developing Teachers

In the societal turn toward neoliberalism, and to some degree as jobs declined in sectors of the economy, teacher education programs have been admitting students less selectively because of drops in enrolment (Giroux, 2002; Legislation Higher Education Policy, 2013; Sleeter, 2008). Students might choose programs by location, convenience or prestige, rather than focus of the program. Ideologically rigid students that profess best intentions are accepted to teacher education programs, as a means of financially supporting the program (Sleeter, 2008). The goals of some critically focused teacher education programs, perhaps conveyed in some form to students pre-enrolment, are possibly realized by analyzing and exploring ways students have understood and perceived personal classroom experiences, helping students acquire a criticity, (Rodriguez, 2008) in considering the existing society and the attendant social relations of power and production. Practices likely include discussing and deconstructing race, gender, ability and sexuality within the larger societal context (Case, 2013). Students may not fully realize what this means and the introspection it may require (Darling-Hammond, 2006). Coursework with focus on multicultural education, diversity in the classroom and

classroom methods challenge teachers in the hope that they adopt transformative curricular and pedagogical epistemologies though they may not fully explore deeply held ideologies. A common, but not universal application of social justice is a teacher focused on social stratification rather than criticality, as part of the coercive measure adopted by the school administration (Hill, 2007). Instead of a teacher that works to uncover the social relations of production or exploitation taking a position with students and work against existing power structures, the teacher often sees his or her responsibility as developing neoliberal social capital (Hinchey & Cadiero-Kaplan, 2005; Zeichner, 2010).

The doctrine of an equitable educational system rests on the philosophical acceptance of several foundational elements, potential for social stratification or moving above ones social class. The experience ensures the focus of teacher education programs include notions based on American democracy, pluralism, capitalism and citizenship (Barber, 1997). Important critiques of neoliberal and neoconservative practice and how they safeguard the social relations of production are all but silenced (Zeichner, 2010 & 2011). In adopting a posture promoting neoliberal social capital, educational stakeholders adopt policies in a perceived move towards educational equity (Evetts, 2011). Taken as the progressive political ideal, teachers slowly embrace the less than equitable superstructure (Apple, 2000). The theory: society as a functioning system whose ameliorative value lies in individual ability to affect, modify or transform the selfsame system. The preceding is a *proto* Hegelian hallucination; the system can be equitable while exploiting the most vulnerable of its citizens. Reinforcing neoliberalism in this way nurtures the acceptance of exploitation in the pursuit of the "best" things life can offer, a new car, home, yearly vacation and all consumer goods required to appear successful (Apple, 2000). These ideals allow teacher *qua man* -the elite- to drive to poor schools from their middle class suburban community without considering the messianic nature of their appearance; it is as if Christ descends from and then re-ascends to the heavens at days end.

Neoliberalism, Globalization and Teacher Preparation

As blue-collar jobs leave the United States, skilled jobs become high demand. The shift ensures the educational apparatus produces the labor skills the social machine requires (Kozol, 2005). Students are taught to think according to narrowly held beliefs about criticality and technicism, to be of value in the global neoliberal workforce. This neoliberal mothering of workers ensures they produce labor power wealthy corporate owners collect. Globalization then ensnares education by promising jobs and livelihoods for the new servants [service and technically skilled workers] the strategically limited dynamic thinkers. Education becomes a microcosm of this strategic invasion (Kincheloe, 2009). Common Core and other specifically designed programs create, as with past initiatives, workers who are cultivated for a specific purpose- in this case to fill skill-based jobs of the 21st century (Sterling, 2002). Programs like these require certain teaching methods, student requirements and universalized objective knowledge all of which limit dynamic critical thinking. Just as No Child Left Behind (NCLB), Race to the Top and other programs have prepared students for bureaucratic forms of automation, the new curricula, similarly, produces students for the neoliberal workforce (Torres, 2008).

Clearly we have arrived at a moment of crisis of teacher preparation; the US National Council of Governors (the body responsible for Common Core) requires ensuring student teachers accept their limited role in the classroom (De Lissovoy, 2014). A decade of NCLB taught experienced teachers that to struggle against the way things are is futile. Literacy and numeracy programs as well as other subjects that have survived NCLB are curricula handed down, nay mandated by state, district and school building administrators (Baltodano, 2012). A teacher's role is merely to ensure delivery of the daily script, the school community is the programmed populace Marshall McLuhan and George Orwell predicted; the schooling curriculum is the program input, the output is the think-speak from the mouths, daily interactions and other ways of being of the labor force. Teachers must not stray beyond our limited roles (Katz, 2008) as any fracture or divergence from the system ensures we are assigned a jail cell, psychotherapist or relegated to the margins of society as a crackpot.

Furthermore, globalization continues to reshape and transform the world's ecology. All social relations are tied to production under the guise of democracy (Rodriguez, 2009) developing a globalized epistemology in the world is a neoliberal game of hopscotch in which Western countries vie for power as they traverse the globe raping the earth for her natural resources and acquiring new and ever expanding markets (Hudis, 2005). Developing countries adopt policies created by Western power brokers compliant to the exploitation of their natural resources and labor force, neoliberalism becomes the narcotic developing nations crave. As mentioned above neoliberal education policies ensure schools produce the limited skill worker and the functionally illiterate citizen (Kozol, 2011). The global zeitgeist then is the labor force accepting their lot and cheering, as drone strikes are unleashed, rivers are dammed and forests are cut down. Countries accepting neoliberal thinking as the new religion invest in its success. Advancing the scope of neoliberalism to include countries like China and India ensures its perpetuation in Western countries. Further compliance, transformation or development of world markets secured as the tether of neoliberal capital ties major world economies (Hill & Kumar, 2012). The result is the obliteration of cultural diversity; the new world cultures are the global elite and its antipode, the global neoliberal labor force.

From Method and Design to Essay

This paper began as a one-year critical study by Arturo and Kevin of what we considered very limited practices in the preparation of teachers. As Kevin began doctoral coursework in which he was assigned student teachers as part of his scholarship obligation, we began to examine comments made by his and my student teachers about their relationship to the teacher preparation program and how the students identified required methods courses in curriculum and pedagogy and their further understanding of its relationship to student teaching. As our study developed we considered, auto-ethnography and direct pedagogical observation (Angrosino & Rosenburg, 2011) or critical observation for social justice as means by which to understand the dissimilar experiences of our students. As a tool for research, auto ethnography helped us, "investigate how we articulate our own selfhood as educators of teachers through narrative and how this informs and develops our professional identities which we construct and re-construct in response to the continuing uncertainties and ambivalences within the initial education of teachers" (Hayler, 2011, p. 1-2). Understanding student teachers through our direct observations and reflections auto ethnographically allowed us to relate our own experiences in the classroom to students we know well as they struggle to become teachers (Freire, 2000). We used anecdotal examples from a first person perspective, informed and analyzed data based on the experiences we shared with our teachers in classrooms and through our relationship with them. Auto-ethnography offered us a way to recall our daily interactions with student teachers while minimizing the limitations of taking field notes. Field notes, as understood by the research community offer the researcher a means by which to collect code and then analyze data. As we interact with our student (subjects) we are not dispassionate, the interactions we record are laced with our personal and moral commitment to a critically responsive ethical posture.

The claim of objectivity would support an idea of sameness, meaning what happens in a given field is reproducible in another. Any attempt at validity, given the singularity of experience or generalizability, appears as a rupture to the existing paradigm of field research. What we mean is this study, which became a critical essay, would be useful to others insofar as it provides an opportunity to continue developing a criticity/criticality in which we further apprehend the nature of being (Hegel, 1977) within our material realities. In this case, the diverse experiences of our student teachers in their preparation programs and in their own classrooms, and our understanding of the significance of our work with our students, is derived or limited by our ability to approach and then discuss the many meanings of our experience in the field. Analysis of our data then would be a mutually agreed upon narrative given the original assumption mentioned above: student teachers may or may not experience critical and/or culturally responsive education in teacher preparation programs, ideologies may or may not be adequately considered in programs, the assumption, teachers may or may not reassume or later become re-indoctrinated into the existing hegemonic hierarchical power structures (Bartolomé, 2007). In other words, the rituals and traditions of schooling and the curriculum often consume teachers, their response, to forgo a critical posture.

We understand the problem in this case to be a neoliberal ideology and a relational emphasis on schooling that reverses or insures critical work is limited in classrooms. The purpose of this inquiry then, is to examine examples of this tension in our work with student teachers and to highlight anecdotal examples that demonstrate the tensions between critical teacher education, relationships and practice. That said, we considered: what if any are limiting factors for the nurturing of critically and culturally responsive student teachers? How might we work with our student teachers to ensure their personal commitment to and the further development of a critically and culturally responsive educational point of view?

Narrative Analysis

Arturo

In the years since I began teaching in the undergraduate program at a western regional comprehensive university I have come to an understanding of human nature. In the classroom the eyes of the students made me nervous, initially shy I began to accept the gaze that was there for many years. Our experience was the only time they had been taught by a person of color. As mentioned in other papers, I always ask the students what they would like to do and what they expect from our experiences. In the classroom every idea posited by the students or myself is open to further consideration, development or negation. As I understand it, classroom epistemology is dependent on my experience with the subject, how much I know and what material I can provide my students to add to their previous experiences in other classrooms. It is then we can negotiate meaning as we derive a new or transformative epistemology.

How do I know they get it? I engage the classroom everyday as I see many of my experiences in society. I register the smile, apprehension, acceptance, boredom and dislike. Most of the time, like many teachers I am on, what I mean is, I am sufficiently prepared and I genuinely love what I do as to communicate my joy for the experience with my students. I know if they have read because we develop several orders of schema, concepts related to the subjects we discuss but more importantly relevant to their future careers in education. And, I know if they are acquiring not merely approaching the subject to get through class because in all my classes I expect students to prepare a teaching demonstration consistent with the ideas we have been considering. As the days, weeks, months and years ensue I get to know students who are excited to learn, students who are gaming the system and students so ideologically conditioned they either negate anything I or the other students say or write their revulsion into the end of semester evaluation. These are the students I see in the field, as I have been a university-school liaison in area school districts. They are the students that give us the most concern as we write this paper. I can see them discussing social justice, transformative pedagogies and multicultural education in the classroom and then act in opposition to these ideas in the field.

Winter, it was hard to start my car; I drove carefully to the student teaching field placement site. As I entered the classroom of what is considered one of the best students in our program, that is, the student excelled on the *Praxis* exams for certification, received excellent marks in all coursework and can debate curriculum and pedagogy with the best of them, I noticed how the student arranged the classroom. All the students of color sat in the back. The light skin or white students sat together in front of the room. A heavyset student was isolated from the group. As the student-teacher delivered the lesson, the student-teacher catered to the small group in front of the room while almost ignoring the children in the back rows and the isolated student. As the lesson ended the student teacher circled the room providing help where needed, in each case the student-teacher reached out to the well dressed and middle class kids placing her hand on their shoulders while not repeating the same with students of color, the isolated student was all but forgotten.

The above scenario is repeated in many of the classrooms I visit with student teachers or teachers who have graduated from our program. When I ask individual teachers about the way they situate the children, how they conduct activities or how they relate to the children as they give a lesson, they seem confused, they understand I see something in the lesson and will ask about its consistency with our coursework and classroom discussions and how they in turn see the needs of the

students. After the above lesson I ask the teacher, have a look at the classroom, can you tell me what you see? A look of horror overcomes the teacher as the teacher realizes what has occurred. We then discuss how even the most progressive/critically minded teachers fall into the trap of existing relations of power.

Kevin

I present myself as approachable to student teachers early in the semester. Recognizing this, several student teachers developed a group where they would speak with me about aspects of teaching and relationships after class. Some were frightened at the prospect of being teachers in ways discussed in class and I hoped our conversations would help them understand the profession was far more complex, personal and demanding than they may have imagined. We would discuss their hopes, fears, and experiences for several hours after class. For some this was therapeutic, alleviating fears of not meeting what they understood to be traditional schooling expectations, expectations based on what was discussed in class or social awkwardness. For others it was a space to trouble what they understood to be a disconnection between the theory of class and the reality of the classroom.

The following story is an experience of one of my student teachers, her relationship with her student and our work together to understand the complex intersection of critical student teacher and traditional classroom relationships. Mandy (pseudonym) was a particularly strong student teacher that developed a bond with one of her students. This was a child many of the other teachers had deemed too *challenging* and *defiant*. She asked me if I had any ideas for supporting this student, who had been willing to talk with her but was somewhat reluctant to share anything meaningful. I asked that my student teacher tell me about her student. Mandy responded by suggesting the student would shout out at inappropriate times and would, all of a sudden, be very moody in class. I framed the question differently. What did she really know about the student? Taking my meaning, Mandy understood that she did not really know about the student beyond their classroom and hallway interactions. She was asking the student to share without first sharing of herself.

Mandy began speaking informally with her student outside of class. To her shock, what she had understood as strange behavior in the classroom continued in these discussions. After one of our discussions, I suggested she ask if she could join her student at church the next weekend. Her student agreed and she joined the family at church. The student's mother was so impressed and grateful for Mandy's interest in her daughter that she invited her to dinner. At dinner, Mandy finally understood the reason for the strange behavior. Her student's father was in prison, an inmate on death row.

After visiting with the family, many other students began to demonstrate their gratitude that Mandy had become a greater part of their community. A largely Chicano and low socioeconomic high school population, the students were shocked that a teacher cared about them so much. The students told Mandy that they had many teachers that said they cared, but those teachers lived in different communities and the students felt they were not interested in their lives beyond the classroom. I observed Mandy as a teacher thorough the semester and was able to see this genuine connection as I continued to mentor her through the student teaching experience.

A few weeks later, the family Mandy had visited experienced an unthinkable tragedy. The student's father was executed by the state. Naturally the family, her student and Mandy were all devastated. Though she had not met him, Mandy was almost inconsolable with grief at our next meeting. She shared with me that she felt like she needed to hug her students but felt she could not, questioning the appropriateness of what she knew to be the only human way to comfort her student. Mandy second-guessed the way she wanted to respond to her student in the face of this trauma. Hamstrung by unknown legal concerns, her behavior was altered based on what she knew to be the human response. As if frozen by neoliberal cultural norms she knew what could and should be done but hesitated to do it. She was appreciative of my friendship and support having spent several hours discussing what had happened.

Relationships are an often-overlooked part of learning to teach. Mandy's teacher had no idea that anything was happening with their student. Of the eight cooperating teachers working with my student teachers that semester, two were phenomenal and demonstrated the care and support that was needed in and beyond the classroom. Five were good or fine teachers, and mentored by demonstrating instructional practices that they thought the teachers could utilize in the future. These teachers the school valued because they did not experience discipline problems and their students did well with standardized testing. One teacher however, was deficit minded. She blamed the students for all her classroom problems, mentioning they were not smart and that my student teacher could do nothing in their support. This particular student teacher was not very strong and the teacher said that this was the reason she struggled. The problem worsened as the student teacher began to enjoy having the built in excuses that her cooperating teacher mentor offered.

There were many changes in the lives of the Cooperating Teachers that semester. Two of the strong host teachers considered leaving the classroom. One planned to return to graduate school and the other was offered a position as an administrator. The challenge of supporting students, as she knew she needed to was too much for this teacher and she needed a change. The deficit minded teacher was also changing jobs. She had been offered a position as a vice-principal because of the work she did with the so-called *challenging* students. Her classroom was based on passing tests and included an un-rigorous curriculum. I was perplexed. Did the school recognize her lack of suitability for the classroom and think this would be a more appropriate position or did they genuinely view her as a quality educator?

Discussion

Neoliberalism, Globalization and the Teaching Profession

Culturally and critically responsive teachers value culture, understanding teaching is not a relationship of binary opposites. Critical teachers appreciate what each brings to the classroom, student and teacher, and work to further develop an understanding of the funds of knowledge (Gonzalez, Moll & Amanti, 2006) of their students and the needs of co-creating the classroom epistemology (Magill & Rodriguez, 2015). The ways teachers and students understand the unique living expressions of teaching and learning as they approach the curriculum is the difference between ensuring the further creation of a servant class or an emancipated, critical and democratically functioning public who possess the agency to transform the world for generations to come.

It is not enough for teachers to call for the liberalization of society, espouse tolerance, while continuing to mindlessly teach racist, classist, and passive lessons with a reproductive view toward deficit pedagogy. Teacher education must include a vision of our globalized world. Furthermore, the teacher must experience life in the ways understood by her (his) students as they apply their own criticity (Rodriguez, 2008), to the creation of localized, asymmetrical power relations. The teacher as active social agent is a societal imperative. The need for teachers to comprehend diversity is paramount to the uncovering of an obscure humanity: the nurturing of critically responsive teachers to surmount challenges in embracing difference, recognize their own and their students value and transcend oppressive ideologies, ideas of class distinction, and immerse themselves in the development of their community and world.

Consider the student teachers in the above narrative analysis. The first teacher did not fully realize alienation she inadvertently caused in her classroom. She fell into the basic ideological formation governing society and schooling. Though she was well read in critical and social justice literature, classroom structure took priority over the students' learning. In the second example, the teacher felt uncomfortable offering love and support she knew was needed because she was worried about policy. This is the commodification of human emotion, which occurs when neoliberalism rather than humanity is sacrosanct.

Historical notions of humanity change as societies frame social reflection and interaction as ancillary to self-interest. In a fetishism of commodities value becomes exalted as schools of education

pursue enrollments, neglecting the under-considered costs of training people to be less human. The ideological transformation of what it means to be human becomes an afterthought in the culture of identity's (Horkheimer & Adorno, 2002) societal discourse. Resulting comprehensions of the reciprocal [educational/societal] relationship become limited to correct answers to multiple choice test questions. As culture reinforces appropriate understandings of humanity, the hard work of the individual becomes dignified as gatekeepers benefit from the isolating nature of the culture program that is reward and punishment. Power brokers, politicians, administrators and teachers, receivers of both the cultural and monetary benefits of society have been trained to dissuade communal conceptions of difference. Communication that lacks action (Habermas, 1990), hierarchy, determines who will receive credit in a neoliberal society while driving effort toward individualism and away from collective reasoning, a transformative praxis.

As hegemonic linguistic structures create normative discourse, the chosen [students] are funneled toward increasingly narrow understandings of humanity. Discourse becomes study (Marcuse, 1991) and the consequences for philosophical meta-analyses are seen as antagonistic or revolutionary to the above-mentioned powerbrokers, rather than democratic, as in the case of the Ferguson riots, as people give voice to their opinions. These considerations are enforced via the social structure; disobedience to the normal exists only beyond the closed analytical structure. Insubordination becomes propaganda (Marcuse, 1991) for the hegemonic order in the war against critical reflection. [Transgression of the discourse beyond the closed analytical structure is incorrect, although the means of enforcing the truth and the degree of punishment are very different]. As long as 'rules were followed' communal complacency keeps those with systemic understandings classed above those who constantly work to assimilate or fight unjust practices. Consider the entirety of the educational experience as a socio-historical "ecosystem" (Sexton, 2008) that reaches far beyond the classroom, as the marginalized fight towards equilibrium in the face of injustice. Humanity, given global neoliberal capitalist notions, becomes the jar at Starbucks, blue recycling bins and checking the organ donor box in a forced but welcome separation of justice in practice and justice in reality.

The above perception of humanity is gladly accepted and happily passed to students, as educators become besieged by frivolous practices, forced to make sacrifices to humanity in service of time. Young teachers survive by discarding social justice in favor of test score improvement. Students who understand the system or proper ways to act receive needed support while the misunderstood other are left wanting. In spite of best intentions, teachers develop and learn compassion in its failed social form, which as Raya Dunayevskaya and Peter Hudis posit, divide, oppress and commodify society. In the shift towards a value added teacher, "individuals become dominated by social relations, products of their own making" (Hudis, 2013, p. 207). Teachers then, are the arbiters of these relations and the carrot of their student's and their own dependency.

How then can educators, support students without relying on what Peter Hudis (2005) calls the, "value form of mediation" (para. 13) in a system bordering apathy and greed? Human as commodity exacerbates issues of economic inequality, social instability and environmental destruction, which underscore the need to reimagine the human relationships, how they are understood and how they are explained in relation to capital (Hudis, 2011). Teacher educators must understand humanity as the opportunity to create the conditions for a communal praxis. We begin with the classroom and continue toward the global community in support of teacher acknowledgement of ideological and humanitarian shortcomings in education and the curriculum. It is in the society where students, teachers and the disenfranchised are not faceless and nameless that humanity will accept new forms of understanding. New cognition (Dunayevskaya, 2000), results from dynamic understandings embedded in human liberation when the actions of the disenfranchised are understood.

The expression of critical teacher humanism is not limited to neoliberal pressures on teacher formation. Rather, pivotal to genuine care in the way it may affect educational practice; learning to teach with candid acts of care in culturally relevant pedagogy, diversity of practice, and anti-othering. Consider the historical normativity white society has institutionalized in identifying reasons for an achievement gap between those of different cultures. Understanding the gap (Delpit, 2006) highlights

the importance of culture and the further development of one's primary language. Without them, students from ethnically and linguistically diverse backgrounds often feel lost. Descriptions of how students experience school situations include feeling, invisible and unheard. The counter extreme is also problematic. Often students are hypervisible particularly as small communities of othered students begin to form (Delpit, 2012). Students subsequently become unresponsive to normalized strategies as culture is neglected further. Identification or lack thereof is not limited to students of color, but to all students who feel unrepresented. Confusions across areas of educational difference create many challenges for teachers as they find difficulty, "communicating across social differences, race or class lines or any situation of unequal power" (Delpit, 2006, p.135). Misunderstandings therefore lead to fear or cultural rejection as teacher or students are othered.

Multicultural and culturally relevant teacher education, on the other hand, is essential for the development of critically conscious teachers. Because teachers may develop narrow epistemological understanding of society, they do not realize the bias and limited practices an unobservant reading of the world (Freire, 2000) can have on one's students. Culturally relevant practices address student needs, which are limited by standardization. Teachers must be educated to meet the unique needs of their students, and not to simply mete out the whims of the state, as Gay (2010) notes, the unconscious understanding of the world is framed by culture. It regulates the ways we think, believe, and behave, thus the teacher becomes the facilitator of culture, but only in so much as she or he can understand student culture. When this does not occur, teachers often employ subtractive schooling (Valenzuela, 1999) in an attempt to develop understanding, or common ground. It assumes that a student can restart an educational experience rejecting what they already know. Rejection of their own culture then becomes a rejection of the student in normalized classroom experiences.

Finally, the idea that teacher education programs are fully effective in their practice operates under the assumption that teachers can acquire the "tools" needed for a knowledge-based society. Neoliberal notions of what it means to educate are limited to quasi-structuralist or quantitative measures of student performance. Resultant, predictable student outcomes and anticipated answers to standardized questions are valued. In many of the ways classroom instruction has failed students, teacher education programs fail new teachers. The status quo is re-inscribed via limits to teacher "training". Darling-Hammond (2006) identifies several learning principals to be considered as students enter class: they have prior knowledge, they need to organize that knowledge conceptually, and they will learn more effectively if they can manage their own learning. A perfectly scripted curriculum in which all students do the same things and learn in the same ways is not possible, yet standardization prevails. Consider a critical perspective in the ways education is perceived and for the expectations we have of it. Bureaucratic standardization practices cannot be the only measure by which we consider success if indeed we attempt to cultivate the critically minded citizen. In the current educational climate, those choosing to teach will experience far different outcomes and emotional reactions than they did as they attended school. This is both because the profession lacks a diversity of "other" perspectives, values and bodies, but also because it lacks a diversity of understanding.

Conclusion

We do not offer quick solutions, the challenges encountered in teaching and learning and required attention to self often limit the ability for a student teacher to see the full implications of their practice and analyze experience beyond the superficial. In social justice education, it is our task to help students understand this experience as they develop more complete understandings of teacher and school culture. Major considerations for helping student teachers developed in this way include: building strong and supportive relationships, the eradication of self-doubt, asking carefully worded thought provoking questions, offering space for critical thinking and creativity, supporting and encouraging socially just pedagogy and facilitating personalized reflexive praxis.

Teachers are able to maintain their racist and classist views, if even subconsciously, as they leave preparation programs and enter the school community. Often the school supports this behavior,

in that the school, as principal actor in the education of children, upholds traditional assumptions about culture, social capital and skills necessary to succeed in the global neoliberal labor market. This comes at the expense of a community's cultural heritage. Languages, for example, are lost at a faster rate than ever in human history because of their perceived lack of value in a global neoliberal labor community. Our Disneylandified empire is killing culture as it kills the world's people: culture's death is not violent, but slow and principally unnoticed. Students' will and do require skill sets never before seen or experienced in history. As teachers prepare students for work in the globalized neoliberal labor market it becomes necessary to foster criticity, a concrete consciousness for a self and social examination. What are the effects of my personal ecological footprint (Sterling, 2002)? What are the effects of my personally held beliefs in my interactions with others? Complacency, the idea that my footprint does not matter or I refuse to change, ensures a linear march toward an ecological Armageddon (Bellamy-Foster, 2002; Kovel, 2002).

Student teachers enter university/college programs in the hope they will acquire the job skills necessary to secure a suitable teaching position and future. Yet those who lack a commitment to social justice or are sufficiently ideologized to the logic of state power and the global neoliberal labor market continue to make their way into these programs. Often, upon completion of their programs these student teachers lack experience with poverty or diversity and, baptized in neoliberal thinking do not understand the implications their lack of a full grasp of their students social or cultural experience has for teaching. Student teachers consciously espouse personal release of power and cultural inclusion but lived experiences with asymmetrical power relations continue to frame their education and teaching, ensuring traditional conformity to methods and understandings. This serves, perhaps despite the student teacher's best intentions, to reinforce the existing social hierarchy, while reproducing inequitable pedagogical experiences for their students. Does the student teacher realize this same structure has helped him or her achieve schooling success? The system must work, how else has he or she gained acceptance to an institution of higher education and been admitted to the ranks of the newly minted teacher?

Teachers in the field often revert to prior culturally biased assumptions of the other when faced with stress, testing, norming of traditional practice and curriculum requirements. The development of teacher as professional and teacher as cultural worker in contrast to teacher as value manufacture mechanism requires preparation programs to frame the profession as such. Teachers too often are prepared for the bureaucracy and limited nature of the profession rather than for facilitating educational praxis. Change must come in the form of self-critique and institutional flexibility that allow for reflections about culturally biased assumptions and facilitation of community relationships, rather than cultural tourism. Teachers are keepers of culture; at stake is the further loss of ethnic, group and ecological identity beyond neoliberal Americana, ultimately the ability to solve the inevitable future crises of a neoliberally globalized world: environmental degradation, mass availability of weapons, water, food, energy shortages, pandemic disease, global warming, etc. The solution will not come from a culture wrapped bottom line but from a society valuing humanity and its relationship to the natural environment.

References

Abowitz, K. K., & Harnish, J. (2006). Contemporary discourses of citizenship. *Review of educational research*, *76*(4), 653-690.

Angrosino, M., & Rosenberg, J. (2011). Observations on observation: Continuities and challenges. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 467-478). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Apple, M. (2000). *Ideology and Curriculum*. SUNY Press, New York.

Ball, A. F., & Tyson, C. A. (2011). *Studying diversity in teacher education*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Baltodano, M. (2012). Neoliberalism and the demise of public education: The corporatization of schools of education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *25*(4), 487-507.

Barber, B. (1997). Public schooling: Education for democracy. In J.I. Goodlad & T.J. McMannon (Eds.), The public purpose of education and schooling (pp. 21 -32). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bartolomé, L. (1994). Beyond the methods fetish: Toward a humanizing pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, *64*(2), 173-195.

Bartolomé, L. I. (2007). CHAPTER 15: Critical pedagogy and teacher education: Radicalizing prospective teachers. *Counterpoints*, *299*, 263-286.

Bellamy-Foster, J. (2000). *Marx's Ecology*. Monthly Review Press, New York.

Blackledge, A. (1998). The institutionalization of inequality: The initial teacher training national curriculum for primary English as cultural hegemony. *Educational Review*, *50*(1), 55-64.

Bourdieu, P. (1999). Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction. *Modernity: Cultural modernity*, (2), 351.

Bourdieu, P. (2011). The forms of capital. In, Szeman, I. & Kaposy, T. (Eds.) Cultural theory: An anthology. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. *Cultural theory: An anthology*, 81-93.

Bruce, B. C. & Eryaman, M. Y. (2015). Introduction: Progressive Impuls in Education. In M. Y. Eryaman & B. C. Bruce (Eds.). *International Handbook of Progressive Education*. New York: Peter Lang, pp. 1-52

Carr, D., & Skinner, D. (2009). The cultural roots of professional wisdom: Towards a broader view of teacher expertise. *Educational philosophy and theory*, *41*(2), 141-154.

Case, K. (2013). *Deconstructing privilege: Teaching and learning as allies in the classroom*. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2004). *Walking the road: Race, diversity, and social justice in teacher education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Cuban, L. (1989). The "at risk" label and the problem of urban school reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 70, 780-784, 800-801.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2004). Inequality and the right to learn: Access to qualified teachers in California's public schools. *Teachers College Record*, 106, 1047-1085.

Darling- Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful teacher education: lessons from exemplary programs*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2011, November 9). *Teachers paid much less than their peers*. Retrieved October 13, 2015, from http://www.usnews.com/debate-club/are-teachers-overpaid/teachers-paid-much-less-than-their-peers

De Lissovoy, N. (2014). *Education and Emancipation in the Neoliberal Era: Being, Teaching, and Power*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Delpit, L. (2012). *Multiplication is for white people: raising expectations for other people's children*. New Press Perseus Distribution, New York.

Delpit, L. (2006). *Other people's children: cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: New York Press, W.W. Norton.

Denzin, N. K. (2003). *Performance ethnography: Critical pedagogy and the politics of culture*. New York: Sage.

Derrida, J., Bass, A., & Ronse, H., (1982). *Positions*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think.* Boston: D. C. Heath.

Dunayevskaya, R., (2000). *Marxism & freedom: from 1776 until today*. Humanity Books, Amherst.

Eryaman, M. Y. (2006). Traveling beyond dangerous private and universal discourses: Radioactivity of radical hermeneutics and objectivism in educational research. Qualitative Inquiry, 12(6), 1198-1219.

Eryaman, M. Y. (2007). From reflective practice to practical wisdom: Toward a post-foundational teacher education. International Journal of Progressive Education, 3(1), 87-107.

Eryaman, M. Y. & Riedler, M. (2009). From interpretive progressivism to radical progressivism in teacher education: Teaching as praxis. In M. Y. Eryaman (Ed.). *Peter McLaren, education, and the struggle for liberation*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Evetts, J. (2011). A new professionalism? challenges and opportunities. *Current Sociology, 59*(4), 406-422.

Foucault, M., & Gordon, C., (1980). *Power/knowledge*. Pantheon Books, New York.

Foss, A. (2002). Peeling the onion: Teaching critical literacy with students of privilege. *Language Arts, 79*(5), 393-403.

Freedom Writers, 2007. Directed by LaGravenese, R. United States: Paramount Pictures

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Freire, P. (1998). *Teachers as cultural workers: Letters to those who dare teach.* Boulder: Westview Press.

Gay, G., (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory research and practice*. Teachers College Press, New York.

Giddens, A. & Sutton, P. (2009). *Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity.

Giroux, H.A. (2015). *Education and the crisis of public values: Challenging the assault on teachers, students, and public education* (Second ed.). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Giroux, H. (2002). Neoliberalism, corporate culture, and the promise of higher education: The university as a democratic public sphere. *Harvard educational review*, *72*(4), 425-464.

González, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (Eds.). (2006). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Habermas, J., (1990). *Moral consciousness and communicative action*. MIT Press, Cambridge.

Hayler, M. (2011). Auto-ethnography, self-narrative and teacher education. Rotterdam: Sense.

Hegel, G. W. F., & Miller, A. V. (1977). *Phenomenology of the spirit*. Oxford University Press, New York.

Hill, D. (2007). Critical teacher education, new labour, and the global project of neoliberal capital. *Policy Futures in Education*, *5*(2), 204-225.

Hill, D., & Kumar, R. (Eds.). (2012). *Global neoliberalism and education and its consequences*. Routledge.

Hinchey, P. H., & Cadiero-Kaplan, K. (2005). The future of teacher education and teaching: Another piece of the privatization puzzle. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 3*(2).

Horkheimer, M., Adorno, T., & Noerr, G. S., (2002). *Dialectic of enlightenment: philosophical fragments*. Stanford: University Press.

Hudak, G. M., & Kihn, P. (2001). Labeling: Pedagogy and politics. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Hudis, P. (2013). *Marx's Concept of Alternatives to Capitalism*. Haymarket Books, Chicago.

Hudis, P. (2011). *Marx's concept of the transcendence of value production.* Loyola University Press, Chicago.

Hudis, P. (2005). Marxist-Humanism and the Struggle for a New Ecology. *The International Marxist-Humanist.* Retrieved May 19, 2014, from http://www.internationalmarxisthumanist.org/articles/marxist-humanism-and-the-struggle-for-a-new-ecology-by-peter-hudis.

Ingersoll, R. M. (1999). The problem of underqualified teachers in American secondary schools. *Educational Researcher, 28*, 26–37.

Ingersoll, R. M. (2003). *Who controls teachers' work? Power and accountability in America's schools*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kardos, S., & Johnson, S. M. (2007). On their own and presumed expert: New teachers' experience with their colleagues. *Teachers College Record, 109*(9), 2083.

Katz, S. J. (2008). Towards a new history of teacher education: A view from critical pedagogy. *American Educational History Journal, 35*(1/2), 41.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2009). Contextualizing the madness: A critical analysis of the assault on teacher education and schools. In *Critical Pedagogy and Teacher Education in the Neoliberal Era* (pp. 19-36). Springer Netherlands.

Kohn, A. (2000). *The schools our children deserve: moving beyond traditional classrooms and tougher standards*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Kovel, J. (2002). *The enemy of nature: The end of capitalism or the end of the world.* Zed Books, New York.

Kozol, J. (2011). *Illiterate America*. New York: Doubleday.

Kozol, J. (2005). *The shame of the nation: The restoration of apartheid schooling in America*. New York: Three Rivers Press.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2013). Lack of achievement or loss of opportunity. In , P. Carter & K. Welner (Eds.) *Closing the opportunity gap: what America must do to give every child an even chance*. Oxford New York: Oxford University Press.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2009). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Legislation - Higher Education - Policy - ED.gov. (2013). Retrieved October 16, 2015, from http://www2.ed.gov/policy/highered/leg/edpicks.jhtml

Magill, K., & Rodriguez, A. (2015). Hope, Rage and Inequality: A Critical Humanist Inclusive Education. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 11(1), 6-27.

Marcuse, H. (1991). *One-dimensional man: studies in the ideology of advanced industrial society*. Beacon Press, Boston.

McLaren, P. (1999). *Schooling as a ritual performance: Toward a political economy of educational symbols and gestures*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Milner, H. R., & Laughter, J. C. (2014). But good intentions are not enough: Preparing teachers to center race and poverty. *The Urban Review, 47*(2), 341-363.

National Center for Education Statistics (2008). *Percentage distribution of school teachers, by race/ethnicity, school type, and selected school characteristics: 2007–08,* retrieved, 21 November 2013 from, http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2009/2009324/tables/sass0708_2009324_t12n_02.asp

National Education Association. (2009, March 10). Status of the American Public School Teacher 2005–2006. Retrieved October 15, 2015, from https://www.unionfacts.com/downloads/Report_Status_of_American_Teachers_05_06.pdf

Erdal, S. O. & Ongel, K. (2003). *Promoting Learner-Centered Instruction Through the Use of Cooperative and Inquiry Learning Strategies*. ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 479308.

Payne, R. K. (1998/2005). *A Framework for understanding poverty* (4th ed.). Highlands, TX: RFT Publishing.

Pensky, M. (2011). Historical and intellectual contexts. In Fultner, B. (Ed) (2011). *Jürgen Habermas: key concepts* (p. 54–73). Durham: Acumen.

Peske, H. G., & Haycock, K. (2006). Teaching Inequality: How Poor and Minority Students Are Shortchanged on Teacher Quality: A Report and Recommendations by the Education Trust. *Education Trust*.

Piaget, J. (1957). *Construction of reality in the child.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Picower, B. (2011). Learning to teach and teaching to learn: Supporting the development of new social justice educators. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 38*(4), 7-24.

Picower, B. (2009). The unexamined whiteness of teaching: How white teachers maintain and enact dominant racial ideologies. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 12*(2), 197-215.

Prinstein, M. J., & Dodge, K. A. (2008). Current issues in peer influence research. *Understanding peer influence in children and adolescents*, (pp. 3-13). New York: Guilford Press.

Rodriguez, A. (2009). On democracy and critical citizenship. *The International Journal of Learning*, 16(6), 331-343.

Rodriguez, A. (2008). Toward a transformative teaching practice: Criticity, pedagogy and praxis. *The International Journal of Learning*, 15(3), 345-352.

Salyer, B. A. (2003). Alternatively and traditionally certified teachers: The same but different. *NASSP Bulletin, 87*, 16-27.

Sexton, D. M. (2008). Student teachers negotiating identity, role, and agency. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 35*(3), 73-88.

Shen, J. (2000). The impact of the altemative certification policy. In J. Mclntyre & D. Byrd (Eds.), *Research on effective models for teacher education* (pp. 235-237). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Sleeter, C. (2012). Confronting the marginalization of culturally responsive pedagogy. *Urban Education, 47*(3), 562-584.

Sleeter, C. (2008). Equity, democracy, and neoliberal assaults on teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(8), 1947-1957.

Sleeter, C.E., & P. McLaren. (1995). *Multicultural education, critical pedagogy, and the politics of difference.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Sleeter, C. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of Whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education* 52, no. 2: 94–106.

Smagorinsky, P., Lakly, A., & Johnson, T. S. (2002). Acquiescence, accommodation, and resistance in learning to teach within a prescribed curriculum. *English Education, 34*(3), 187-213.

Sterling, S. (2002). Sustainable education: Re-visioning learning and change. Totnes: Green Books.

Tajfel, H. (1970). Experiments in intergroup discrimination. *Scientific American, 223*(5), 96-102.

Valencia, R., (2010). *Dismantling contemporary deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice*. Routledge, New York.

Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: US Mexican youth and the politics of c*aring. SUNY Press, Albany.

Vilson, J. L. (2016). The need for more teachers of color. *Education Digest, 81*(5), 17.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walsh, K., & Jacobs, S. (2007). *Alternative certification isn't alternative*. Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Institute and National Council on Teacher Quality.

Willis, P. (1981). *Learning to labor: how working class kids get working class jobs*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Zeichner, K. (2010). Competition, economic rationalization, increased surveillance, and attacks on diversity: Neo-liberalism and the transformation of teacher education in the US. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*(8), 1544-1552.

Zeichner, K. (2012). The turn once again toward practice-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 63*(5), 376-382.